

January 29, 2013

**VIA ELECTRONIC DELIVERY**

Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Room TWA325  
Washington, DC 20554

**Re: Notice of *Ex Parte* Presentation  
CG Docket No. 02-278**

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On Friday, January 25, 2013, Michele C. Farquhar and Mark W. Brennan of Hogan Lovells US LLP, counsel to Communication Innovators (“CI”), along with Darrin Bird, Executive Vice President of Global Connect LLC, met with Kris Monteith, Mark Stone, Kurt Schroeder, John Adams, Kristi Lemoine, and Deborah Broderon of the Commission’s Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau to discuss CI’s pending Petition for Declaratory Ruling (“Petition”) regarding the non-telemarketing use of predictive dialers under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”). The CI and Global Connect representatives distributed the attached handout at the meeting.

During the meeting, the representatives encouraged the Commission to grant the CI Petition and address the confusion regarding whether predictive dialers that lack the required ability to generate and dial random or sequential numbers are “autodialers” under the TCPA. Specifically, the Commission should clarify the meaning of “capacity” in the TCPA and confirm that predictive dialers used for non-telemarketing purposes only qualify as “autodialers” if they have the “current ability” to generate and dial random or sequential numbers. Such equipment must have random or sequential number generation and dialing as a functioning feature – one that can be used readily and without further software or device changes (e.g., without the installation or modification of software or hardware). A broader interpretation of “capacity,” on the other hand, risks encompassing all calls made by and text messages sent by smartphones and other personal devices. Mr. Bird noted that Global Connect’s hosted predictive dialer cloud solution does not have the current ability to generate and dial random or sequential numbers, and such functionality is not available to customers.

The representatives also discussed the significant privacy and consumer benefits of using predictive dialers instead of manual dialing. For example, predictive dialers can prevent improper calls to numbers on Federal, state, or entity-specific do-not-call lists; limit calls to certain times of the day, days of the week, number of attempts per campaign; enable consumer-specific calling preferences (*i.e.*, contact me at my work telephone number during the day and my home telephone number at night); allow a specified amount of time to lapse between calls; provide for timely

scheduled callbacks requested by a customer; and eliminate “wrong number” dialing caused by manual number entry. They also assist companies in complying with Federal and state consumer protection laws. Mr. Bird also discussed the recent beneficial use of Global Connect’s predictive dialers to place calls on behalf of local municipalities, utility companies, and other groups to residents affected by Hurricane Sandy.

In addition, the representatives confirmed that granting the CI Petition will not enable any new unwanted calls. Live representatives are already allowed to dial customers manually for non-telemarketing, informational purposes, and predictive dialers increase efficiency by connecting these live representatives with consumers while weeding out unproductive calls. Granting the CI Petition also will not provide any new ability for parties to send unwanted text messages – companies can already send non-telemarketing, informational text messages manually, and they do not have an incentive to flood customers with informational text messages.

The representatives also explained that the Commission can grant the CI Petition and promote U.S. call center jobs while continuing to prevent telemarketing abuses. The CI Petition is limited to non-telemarketing calls, and the Commission has ample authority to distinguish between telemarketing and non-telemarketing, informational calls when it clarifies the meaning of “capacity.” In fact, the Commission made a similar distinction between telemarketing and informational calls in the *Robocall Report and Order*<sup>1</sup> and the recent *SoundBite Declaratory Ruling*.<sup>2</sup> The Commission can make the same distinction here to facilitate innovative non-telemarketing uses of predictive dialers and other consumer-friendly technologies while still preventing harm from unwanted telemarketing calls. Moreover, the representatives noted that the TCPA has separate do-not-call protections built in to limit unwanted telemarketing calls, including the national registry and company-specific do-not-call lists.

Pursuant to Section 1.1206(b) of the Commission’s rules, I am filing this notice electronically in the above-referenced docket. Please contact me directly with any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Michele C. Farquhar

Michele C. Farquhar  
Counsel to Communication Innovators  
Partner  
michele.farquhar@hoganlovells.com  
D 1+ 202 637 5663

cc: Kris Monteith  
Mark Stone  
Kurt Schroeder  
John Adams  
Kristi Lemoine  
Deborah Broderson

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991*, Report and Order, 27 FCC Rcd 1830 (2012) (“*Robocall Report and Order*”).

<sup>2</sup> See *Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991*, CG Docket No. 02-278, Declaratory Ruling, FCC 12-143 (rel. Nov. 29, 2012) (“*SoundBite Declaratory Ruling*”).

**MEETING TO DISCUSS CI PETITION WITH  
FCC CONSUMER & GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS BUREAU  
JANUARY 25, 2013**

**Overview of key points:**

- **Many commenters agree that the Commission should grant the CI Petition and address the widespread confusion regarding whether predictive dialers that lack the required ability to generate and dial random or sequential numbers are “autodialers” under the TCPA.**
- **There is broad agreement among commenters that the term “capacity” means the “current ability” or “present capacity” (not the “theoretical ability” or “future capacity”).**

<p>To meet this “current ability” standard, equipment must have random or sequential number generation and dialing as a functioning feature – one that can be used readily and without further software or device changes (<i>e.g.</i>, without the installation or modification of software or hardware) – regardless of whether the feature is turned “off” or “on” at the time of use.</p>
---

- **Interpreting “capacity” as “future capacity” unreasonably exposes all smartphone users to TCPA liability for simple misdials.**
- **The comments confirm that the TCPA requires a capacity “to store . . . telephone numbers to be called, *using a random or sequential number generator*” – it is not enough for the equipment to have only the capacity *to store* randomly or sequentially generated numbers.**
- **Commenters overwhelmingly support the use of predictive dialers for innovative, non-telemarketing purposes.**
- **Granting the CI Petition will not allow any new unwanted calls.**
- **To the extent that the Commission may be concerned about enabling unwanted telemarketing calls, it has ample authority to prevent such abuse while still granting the CI Petition.**
- **Although prior express consent is a defense in TCPA litigation, it is a costly defense to exercise.**